Document 8

Problem: Over the past year, its been uncertain to many of us whether we agreed to these two changes so the questions are:

1) Do we all agree to incorporate the recommendations from the PCC linking entry task group to no longer suppress linking entries, even when providing a 580 or other note?

2) Do we agree to change the 776 $c practice for microforms?

Background:

Task Group on Linking Entries: Final Report Feb. 2005:
http://www.loc.gov/catdir/pcc/archive/tglnkentr-rpt05.pdf

Page. 16 Recommendations:

(3) As indicated on p. 6, the task group also recommends reexamination of the coding convention in MARC 21 that prescribes (or appears to prescribe) that the first indicator in a linking entry field be given a value of "1" when a corresponding 580 field is present. While this practice prevents redundant notes, it also defeats the goal of hyperlinking.

From the 2007 Operations Meeting Summary:

Suppressing linking entries:
Agreed to update CEG to incorporate the recommendations from the PCC linking entry task group [i.e. don't suppress linking entries, from my hand written meeting notes LEH]

776 $c practice for microforms: Agreed: Change this practice in the CEG since linking fields are more important for access under the CONSER standard record.